DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 900 HE 008 217

AUTHOR Troutman, James G.
TITLE Faculty Perceptions of College Governance.
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 50p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *College Administration; *College Faculty; Decision Making; *Governance; *Higher Education; Policy Formation; Power Structure; School Involvement; School Surveys; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *York College

ABSTRACT

York College of Pennsylvania, which has moved from a junior college to a four-year institution in the last decade, has responded to accreditation reports that suggested changes in the college's governing structure. A review of the literature showed that faculty should participate in governance on a shared-authority basis. The study was designed to survey the faculty to see how they perceived the governance of the college. The survey was divided into areas of leadership, motivation, communication, interaction, decision-making, setting goals, and feedback control. Particular recommendations were made in areas that were found deficient. The results of the survey demonstrated that the faculty perceived the governance structure somewhere between the benevolent authoritative and consultative forms. The ratings, calculated from highest to lowest, were communication, setting goals, interaction, leadership, motivation, feedback controls, and decision-making. The highest rated question concerned the accuracy of upwards communications; the lowest, the level at which decisions were formally made. Specific recommendations were made for each area involved that had serious deficiencies. In general, the recommendations were to make the governance structure or the college more participatory.
(Author/LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127900

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008217

ABSTRACT

Troutman, James G. Faculty Perceptions of College Governance. Research Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, July, 1976.

York College of Pennsylvania has made some major changes during the past decade. The most major being that of moving from a junior college to a four-year institution. The past two accreditation reports have suggested changes be made in the governing structure of the college. A review of the literature has shown that faculty should participate in governance on a shared authority basis.

The study was designed to survey the faculty to see how they perceived the governance of the college. The survey was divided into areas of leadership, motivation, communication, interaction, decision-making, setting goals, and feedback control. Particular recommendations were made in areas which were found deficient.

The results of the survey demonstrated that the faculty perceived the governance structure of York College of Pennsylvania somewhere between the benevolent authoritative

and consultative forms. The ratings as calculated from highest to lowest were communication, setting goals, interaction, leadership, motivation, feedback controls, and decision-making. The highest rated question concerned the accuracy of upwards communications while the lowest was on the level at which decisions were formally made.

Specific recommendations were made for each area involved that had serious deficiencies. In general, the recommendations were to make the governance structure or the college more participatory.

A STUDY OF FACULTY PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

by

James G. Troutman, M. A.

York College of Pennsylvania

DR. KENNETH VARCOE

EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

July 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PRACTICUM EVALUATION FORM	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
National Governance Trends	1
Faculty Involvement in Governance	2
Faculty Perceptions of Governance	3
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	4
The Need for Faculty Participation	5
Governance by Consent	5
Competency and Diversity of Participants	7
Motivation Research	8
How the Faculty Should Be Involved	10
Justification for the Study	12
PROCEDURES	17
Population Used	17
Statistical Method Used	18
Limitations and Assumptions	18

RESULTS 19

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 22

General Discussion 22

Leadership 23

Motivation 24

Communication 26

Interaction 28

Decision-Making 29

Setting Goals 31

Feedback Control 32

Recommendations 33

Potential for Improvement 35

BIBLIOGRAPHY 37

APPENDIXES

Faculty Questionnaire 42

Cover Letter to Questionnaire 43

Practicum Proposal Approval 44

Peer Reader Form 45

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Representative Changes at York College of Pennsylvania 13

2. Results of Survey in Percent 20

3. Table of Arithmetic Means 21

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade York College of Pennsylvania has experienced major growth. The institution that was formerly York Junior College became a baccalaureate degree granting institution in 1968 and graduated its first senior class in 1970. During this period the student and faculty populations have increased by more than fifty percent.

The participation in governance by the faculty has also increased proportionat during the past decade. An academic senate, academic counci , administrative council, and board of trustee committees were formed. All of these organizations have faculty representation. The purpose of this paper was to measure how the faculty perceives the current governance structure of York College. This perception was used as a basis for comparison with the current literature on college and university governance. Specific recommendations were then made to improve the governance system of the college.

National Governance Trends

The recent changes in governance at York College

are not unique. They have been occurring on a nation wide basis. Olsen (32:361) commenting on these changes stated:

> Higher education in America has undergone a profound alteration in scope and nature in the last decade. The question of who should govern what aspects of the university has presented the institution with a series of interlocking paradoxial problems of college governance.

The change in administrators role in governance as it relates to the faculty is addressed by Richardson (38:16):

> The past three years have been momentous ones for administrators. During this period of time, we have witnessed a revolution in attitudes concerning the role of the faculty in policy formulation. The question today is no longer one of whether faculty will be involved but rather the more serious issue of what the role of the administrator is likely to be should the current trend in the direction of separate faculty organizations for the purpose of negotiating salary and working conditions continue.

Faculty Involvement in Governance

The need for faculty involvement in governance is well established. Dykes (13:5) points out:

> Effective faculty participation in the academic decision-making process is essential. The complex problems confronting institutions of higher education everywhere require the best efforts of the best minds available if they are to be resolved satisfactorily.

Corson (9:97) points out the difference between other organizations and the academic community is, "The authority and responsibility placed in the faculty, as a body, by tradition, by custom, or by formal bylaw or regulation."

The role of active faculty involvement in the governance of an institution is not contrary to the purpose of that institution. The central objective of education is the translation of the capabilities and talents of the faculty into significant educational results. Most decisions made on a college campus have a direct bearing on this objective. To the making of decisions the faculty will have both a valid concern and a capability to make important contributions. John Millett (28:102) supports this idea when he states, "The faculty member does not consider himself an employee of the college but a partner in the operation of the organization."

Perhaps one of the oldest and most eloquent pleas for democratic participation is given by Aristotle (4:123):

> When there are many, each can bring his share of goodness and moral prudence; and when all meet together the people may thus become something in the nature of a single person, who - as he has many feet, many hands and many senses - may also have many qualities of character and intelligence.

Faculty Perceptions of Governance

To measure the faculty perception of governance at York College of Pennsylvania a survey was conducted. The measuring tool was the Likert Scale (19:197-211).

The questionnaire was designed so that each of the twenty questions has four possible responses. They are

associated with the authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participatory patterns of administration. The questionnaire was divided into seven areas of concern. They are leadership, motivation, communication, interaction, decision-making, goal setting, and feedback control. Each area of concern has been evaluated and compared to the current literature. Implications and recommendations have been made from this comparison.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

When the topic of faculty participation in college governance is brought up there appears two questions. Why should the faculty participate in college governance and how should the faculty participate in this governance? Each of these topics have been examined.

Many authors have written in favor of faculty involvement in governance. Among them are Ikenberry (17:371-374), Livingston (21:192-194), and Richardson (38:22). Several authors have surveyed faculty and reported on the results. Perhaps the most comprehensive is the American Association of University Professors Report (2:62-81). Others to use this method are Corson (9), Dykes (13) and Mason (23). Other authors have supported faculty

involvement in governance from the point of view that teaching is a profession. Among these authors is Bidig (6:41). Faculty pressure for an increased role in governance has been used by Livingston (21:191-192) and Mollenberg (29:377-378).

The Need For Faculty Participation

Four basic arguments can be given to justify the need to have faculty participate in college governance. First, the tenet proclaimed by John Locke in that government is established by the consent of those governed. Second, the Jeffersonian ideal that the competence of the ordinary citizen is a valid claim for participation in government. Third, recent research in the behavioral sciences has been demonstrating the great importance of involving personnel of an organization more fully in the decision-making process. And fourth, participation in governance by groups can improve the quality of the decision made. Each of these arguments has been considered in turn.

Governance by Consent. There are several ways one can approach the idea that government is established by the consent of those governed. Perhaps the most common is that of trying to satisfy the pressures of the respective interest groups. Richardson (38:18) first points out that

authority is by consent when he states, "let us draw some brief conclusions concerning the implication that authority depends upon the assent of those governed." Later in that same article, after observing that the administrator has been delegated the authority by the board of control, he states:

> Administrators are employed to provide leadership and to ensure smoothly functioning institutions. A failure to carry out these purposes - whatever the reason and regardless of the principles involved - will result in a lack of confidenc in the administrator and in his eventual replacement.

In a different article (39:21) Richardson observes that increasingly, the combination of student and faculty pressures has caused the consideration of the participatory model of governance. Corson (10:437-438) also recognizes the size and role of the faculty when he reports:

> The reasoning underlying the proposal that such a mechanism (participatory governance) is needed rest on the fact that the college or university must be recognized for what it is - a political community. By "political community" is meant that the institution is made up of several factions, each of which possesses parochial views and the power to disrupt or endanger the institutions operations. Decisions that will stick, that is, that will harness the zeal or at least be accepted, can only be made through a process in which the several factions are consulted, can voice their opinions, and exercise an influence proportionate to the competence they bring to each particular decision.

Other authors have also written about participation as a means for obtaining acceptance of resulting decisions.

Thompson (46:161) states, "Participation by all groups can benefit the pursuit of the university's purpose by helping to secure willing and informed acceptance of decisions."

Competency and Diversity of Participants. The competency and diversity of those who participate in the governance process has often been presented as a favorable argument. Thompson (46:159) claims, "that the combination of knowledge and perspectives of a group yields wiser decisions than those made by single individuals." Harold W. Dodds (12:97) extends this argument. The fundamental reason why the faculty should participate at the highest policy level, "is the cardinal truth that if an institution is to prosper, it must utilize the intellectual application and imaginative thinking of more than the president, vice-presidents, and deans."

When Henderson (15:80) writes about governance through group participation in decision-making he discusses the collegial tradition of colleges:

> Colleges and universities have a strong tradition of collegial spirit and action. The faculty in many senses are peers of administrators. They are professional men and women, and each is expert in his own area of knowledge. If one looks at the classroom or the laboratory where the education and the research take place, it is clear that the professor must play a strong role in determining goals and methods. It can also be contended that since the student is the

> learner, he too will do a better job of learning if he helps map out the goals and the methods. Thus it can be reasoned that the professors and also the students should have a wider participation in determining the over-all goals, the program, and the evaluation procedures.

The diversity of the participants also plays an important part in decision-making in a participatory model of governance. This is brought out by Thompson (46:160) when he writes about improving the quality of decisions. Such decisions are likely to be made more wisely if the diversity of various members who contribute to the college's aims are brought to bear on the issues. He also points out that this is particularly critical in a period of rapid change and intense questioning of the nature of the educational process.

Motivation Research. Among the theorist in motivation research is A. H. Maslow who has formulated a positive theory of human motivation. He discusses (22:90-91) that satisfaction of the self-esteem need, the desire for reputation or prestigue, status, recognition, importance or appreciation, leads to feelings of self-confidence, worth and adequacy of being useful and necessary in the world. Douglass McGregor expands on Maslow's ideas when he states:

> Finally - a capstone, as it where, on the hierarchy - there are the needs for self-fulfillment. These are the needs for realizing one's own potentialities for continued self development, for being creative in the broadest sense of the term.

Herzberg (16:57) points out that satisfiers are achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth. Richardson and Bender (41:40) recognize the importance of motivation in the shared authority model of governance when they write, "The strength of the shared authority model rest with the values they promote, their flexibility in dealing with the need for change and their ability to motivate members to function at higher levels of committment."

Joughin (18:204-205) suggest that faculty participation in institutional governance can play a major part in recruiting new and retaining esteemed faculty. Likert (19:46) points out that, "Shifts toward system four (participatory) are accompanied by long range improvements in productivity, labor relations, cost and earnings." Perhaps Richardson, Blocker, and Bender (42:112) sum it up best when discussing their participatory model of governance:

> Objectives are developed jointly, with the result that there is substantial committment to their achievment by all members within the organization, and corresponding satisfaction when they are achieved. Thus, access to the satisfaction of higher-level needs is not exclusively the province of administrators but is shared with faculty and students.

We have just seen the need for faculty involvement in governance. An examination of the idea of government by consent, the Jeffersonial idea of the competency of the people, and the behavioral science approach to motivation theory have established the necessity and desire for a participatory model of governance. We now turn to the ways in which this involvement can be structured.

How the Faculty Should Be Involved.

The American Association of University Professors and its sister organizations, the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges have always been active in determining the role of faculty in the governance of institutions. The American Association of University Professors has long had a standing committee, Committee T, that addresses itself to college government. Perhaps the most used document concerning college governance is the American Association of University Professors 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. In that document (3:378) the faculty's role is clearly pointed out. The prime responsibilities of the faculty are in areas of curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status and those aspects of student life

which relate to the educational process. The faculty sets the requirements for degrees. Appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal are primarily a faculty responsibility. And finally, faculty should actively participate in the determination of policy and procedures that determine salary and salary increases.

This same document also presents a structure for faculty participation, "Agencies of faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present." This is to point out that both structures and procedures should permit joint participative action by all components of the university.

Mason (23:44) supports the 1966 statement when he discusses the implies shared authority:

> The faculty and the administration particularly participate jointly in influence and decision-making. ...the model makes the faculty predominant in issues where its special knowledge or status so require.

The American Association of University Professors has long believed in faculty participation in college governance. The first recommendation of Committee T's final report on their 1953 study points out this fact very clearly (2:78):

> The committee wishes again to suggest, as it did following the study in 1939, that accrediting agencies be urged to recognize, among the criteria for the judgement of educational institutions, the importance of procedures which provide adequately for faculty participation wherever such participation will be useful. The kinds of consultation employed within a college or university are exceedingly significant as evidence of the quality of the intellectual environment with which the specific institution provides members of its faculty.

The American Association of University Professors appears to be seeking support from accrediting agencies. Other groups have supported them in their quest. Most recently the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (8:41) has made the following recommendation a high priority. "Faculties should be granted, where they do not already have it, the general level of authority as recommended by the American Association of University Professors."

There are other writers who have described specific structures for participatory governance models. It was not the purpose of this paper to examine these various models. What has been established is that a participatory model is desirable and that many groups and individuals have supported this tenant.

Justification for the Study

This brings us to the question of what has happened at York College of Pennsylvania that has led us to make

this report.

The changes that have occured at York College during the past several years have been drastic. Table 1 illustrates several areas of concern to the college that have been typical of these changes. These figures were taken from Data Presented for Consideration by the Commission of Higher Education, Middle States Association, (11) and The Presidents Report to the College, 1974-1975, (27). During the past seven years the budget has increased by 360 %, the number of volumes in the library by 150%, the number of full time faculty by 50% and the number of students (full time equivalent) by 53%. These changes can be extended to all phases of the institution.

Table 1

Representative Changes at
York College of Pennsylvania

Area of Concern \ Academic Year	1967-1968	1974-1975
Budget (Expenses)	$952,370	$4,378,162
Library (Volumes)	34,350	85,963
Faculty (Full Time)	48	72
Students (Full Time Equivalent	1,432	2,187

During this period there has been similar growth in faculty participation in the governance of the college. In 1968 an Academic Senate was formed. This senate consist of all full time faculty, top level administrators and student representatives. Much of the decision-making and policy-setting of the college has been done in the fourteen committees of this senate. In 1972 the Academic Council was formed. This council consist of the Dean of Academic Affairs and the nine department chairmen. This body has been responsible for a large portion of the academic policy of the college. In 1975 the faculty placed voting members on all of the Board of Trustee committees with the exception of the Budget Committee.

It is also important to note that the Middle States Reports of 1969 and 1971 both suggest improvements in the governance structure of the college. The 1969 report (36) states:

> It is recommended that the Board of Trustees and administrative staff demonstrate their interest in understanding students and their problems by (1) establishing clearly defined channels of communication for the college, and (2) providing opportunity for effective student participation in institutional affairs.

Since the college was in a period of transition from a two-year institution to a four-year institution it was to be re-evaluated in 1971. The 1971 report (37:3-4) contains

the following section on Administration and Governance:

> As the college moves into the higher complexities implicit in its new adventures, we sense that careful thought should be given to more effective (in terms of the new complexities) distribution and delegation of authority and responsibility throughout the formal administrative structure, and among those in the faculty and student body who hold quasi-administrative posts. The college is deliberately moving from a necessary emphasis on physical development toward a commitment to find a place in the community of four-year colleges, and this at a time when such institutions are being told that their future existence as private colleges will depend on their unique qualities and contributions. It seems essential, therefore, to the future of the college as a unique institution, that the President and his top administrators have time for contemplation regarding the educational course that is being set. In short the President and his colleagues must have time to "waste" on educational philosophy.
>
> Beyond this, we sense that, correctly or not, faculty and students do not see themselves as being significantly involved in those decisions-making processes that relate to their roles here. It is not clear, nor does it matter especially, why this is so. What matters is how to effect a cure. For, if the administration is to have meditative time, responsibility and authority must be shared.
>
> The formal structure for implementing such sharing of responsibility and authority seems already to exist to a considerable degree. Yet, the relationship among the offices of the President, the Dean of the College, and the Dean of Academic Affairs is for some reason unclear in practice; the lower echelons are confused on the source of decisions and the proper procedures for action in such areas as, for example, personnel decisions, office assignments, and budgetary control. Every effort needs to be exerted to make clear the channels of decision making, to modify them as seems wise, and to use them with confidence.

These reports suggested specific changes be made. The Middle States Association will be re-evaluating York College in 1977. It is important to demonstrate to this association that there have been sincere efforts to improve the governance structure of the college. If the faculty perceive themselves as being significantly involved in the decision-making process then this should be considered a major improvement. The communication structure was also critized as a possible cause of some of the problem. The faculty's perception of the current communication procedures will also be of value.

In the fall of 1976 the current college president will be retiring after eighteen years of service to the institution as chief officer. A new president has been selected. The perceptions of the faculty in the area of college governance can be of great importance in allowing a new executive to gain the confidence and support of his faculty. It is hoped that this report will be of some value to this end.

PROCEDURES

The method that was used to determine how the faculty perceived the governance of York College of Pennsylvania was a survey. The instrument that was used was the Likert Scale (19:197-211).

The questionnaire has been designed so that each of the twenty questions has four possible responses. They are associated with the exploitive authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participative patterns of administration. The questionnaire has the questions divided into seven areas of concern. They are leadership, motivation, communication, interaction, decision making, goal setting and feedback control. Each area of concern has been evaluated and compared to the current literature. Implications and recommendations have been made from this comparison.

Population Used

The survey was distributed to each of the full time faculty members of the college. This included, department chairmen, present and past presidents of the Academic Senate, and committee chairmen.

Statistical Method Used

The results of the survey were first tabulated. Those tabulations were then delt with in two ways. First, the tabulations were changed to percentages so that comparisons could be made. Second, the exploitive authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participatory patterns were assigned numerical values of one, two, three and four respectively. An arithmetic mean was calculated for each of twenty questions, each of the seven areas of concern and a total arithmetic mean for all responses was calculated.

Limitations and Assumptions

Two basic limitations occurred. First, only about fifty-two percent of the questionnaires were returned. Second, and related, the small sample size and the peculiarities of the group limit the generalizations that can be made.

There were several assumptions made. It was necessary to assume that the faculty has an accurate perception of the governance structure of the college. It was assumed that a governance structure can be measured and that the Likert Scale would be an accurate tool with which to make this measurement. It was assumed that the limitations would

not adversly effect the overall results of the survey. And finally, it was assumed that if a research project is designed with care and executed in a similar manner, that the results will be accurate and of value.

RESULTS

The results of the survey have been tabulated and are shown on Table 2 and Table 3. Table 2, on page twenty, contains percentage tabulations for each of the responses to each of the questions on the questionnaire. Those who did not complete a particular question were not counted in the compilation. The percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number and adjusted so that the sum of the responses for any particular question totals one hundred percent.

Table 3, on page twenty-one, contains the arithmetic means. Columns one, two, three, and four were assigned numerical values of one, two, three, and four respectively. These numbers were then used to compute arithmetic means. The arithmetic mean was computed for each question and is listed in the first column of Table 3. The arithmetic mean for each of the areas of concern was computed and is listed in the second column of that same table. An arithmetic mean was computed for all responses and was found to be 2.34.

Table 2

Results of Survey in Percent

			SYSTEM 1	SYSTEM 2	SYSTEM 3	SYSTEM 4
Leadership	1)	How much confidence is shown in subordinates?	8	60	32	0
	2)	How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?	4	50	31	15
	3)	Are subordinates' ideas sought and used, if worthy?	15	66	19	0
Motivation	4)	Is predominant use made of 1) fear, 2) threats, 3) punishment, 4) rewards, 5) involvement?	38	14	29	19
	5)	Where is responsibility felt for achieving org. goals?	31	31	23	15
Communication	6)	What is the direc. of info. flow?	8	38	31	23
	7)	How is downward comm. accepted?	16	24	48	12
	8)	How accurate is upward comm.?	0	29	42	29
	9)	How well do superiors know problems faced by subordinates?	23	54	23	0
Interaction	10)	What is character of interaction?	24	38	38	0
	11)	How much cooperative teamwork is present?	0	44	56	0
Making Decisions	12)	At what level are decisions formally made?	58	27	11	4
	13)	What is the origin of technical and professional knowledge used in decision making?	28	28	44	0
	14)	Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?	5	54	34	8
	15)	What does decision making process contribute to motivation?	19	31	35	15
Setting Goals	16)	How are org. goals established?	0	42	54	4
	17)	How much covert resistance to goals is present?	31	50	19	0
Feedback Control	18)	How concentrated are review and control functions?	31	50	19	0
	19)	Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?	15	19	54	12
	20)	What are cost, productivity, and other control data used for?	13	54	29	4

Table 3

Table of Arithmetic Means

		Arithmetic Mean for this Question	Arithmetic Mean for this Concern
Leadership	1) How much confidence is shown in subordinates?	2.24	2.29
	2) How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?	2.58	
	3) Are subordinates' ideas sought and used, if worthy?	2.04	
Motivation	4) Is predominant use made of 1) fear, 2) threats, 3) punishment, 4) rewards, 5) involvement?	2.29	2.26
	5) Where is responsibility felt for achieving org. goals?	2.23	
Communication	6) What is the direc. of info. flow?	2.69	2.55
	7) How is downward comm. accepted?	2.56	
	8) How accurate is upward comm.?	3.00	
	9) How well do superiors know problems faced by subordinates?	2.00	
Interaction	10) What is character of interaction?	2.15	2.35
	11) How much cooperative teamwork is present?	2.56	
Making Decisions	12) At what level are decisions formally made?	1.62	2.17
	13) What is the origin of technical and professional knowledge used in decision making?	2.16	
	14) Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?	2.46	
	15) What does decision making process contribute to motivation?	2.46	
Setting Goals	16) How are org. goals established?	2.42	2.52
	17) How much covert resistance to goals is present?	2.62	
Feedback Control	18) How concentrated are review and control functions?	1.88	2.25
	19) Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?	2.62	
	20) What are cost, productivity, and other control data used for?	2.25	
The arithmetic mean for all responses was		**2.34**	

The seven questions to receive the highest means were considered above average. They were 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, and 19. The seven questions to receive the lowest means were considered below average. They were 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 18. The remaining six questions in the middle were considered average. They were 1, 4, 14, 15, 16, and 20. The question receiving the highest mean, 3.00, was number eight concerning upward communications. The question receiving the lowest mean, 1.62, was number twelve concerning the level at which decisions are formally made.

The two highest areas of concern were Communications with 2.55 and Setting Goals with a 2.52. The two lowest areas of concern were Making Decisions with a 2.17 and Feedback Control with a 2.25. The three areas of concern in the middle were Leadership, Motivation and Interaction.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The arithmetic mean of 2.34 for all responses places the overall governance structure, as it is perceived by the faculty, between the benevolent authoritative and consultative patterns of management. This does not seem to indicate that the faculty perceives a participatory form of governance at York College of Pennsylvania. If one

accepts the pleas of the literature for a participative structure there appears to be room for improvement at York College. The researcher will make nine specific recommendations towards this end.

It is important to note the significance of a research project conducted in the California Community College system by L. C. Riess (43). In a survey of both administrators and faculty he found that faculty perceived less faculty participation and recommended a higher degree of involvement. On the other hand, administrators perceived a higher level of participation on behalf of the faculty.

Leadership. In order to recognize the implications and to make recommendations concerning this survey, each of the areas of concern on the questionnaire were studied. The arithmetic mean of the leadership area was 2.29, slightly below average. The question concerning confidence shown in subordinates was slightly below average while the question of subordinates talking with superiors was well above average. Question three on the use of subordinates' ideas was well below average.

When Budig (6:31) writes about educational leadership he has the following to say:

> No single function of the administration is more important than articulation of institutional goals and problems in need of resolution. This includes the perceptiveness to recognize broad consensus on institutional or unit mission when such agreement exist, and establishing the mechanisms to arrive at such a consensus when it does not already exist.

Leadership style is also important to authors such as Herzberg (16:55), Reddin (35:229) and Richardson (41:1-9). Likert (19:103) when writing about cooperative behavior states the following principle:

> The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and relationships within the organization, each member, in the light of his background, values, desires, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance.

Recommendation 1: <u>The administration and department chairmen should seek ideas from their subordinates and use them if worthy</u>.

<u>Motivation</u>. The arithmetic mean of the motivation area was 2.26, slightly below average. Both the question on methods of motivation and responsibility for achieving goals were slightly to moderately below average.

Although motivation is only slightly below average it can still be improved. Herzberg (16:57) shows that achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement,

growth and the work itself are motivators. Less than twenty percent of the faculty perceived that rewards and involvement were used as motivators. Participation in the governance system of an institution can be one of many ways of achieving motivation. This is recognized by Joughin (18:205) when he states, "The real question for an institution is what it can offer a man it wants to hold. Here is where faculty participation in institutional government can play a major part."

The behavioral scientist have added much to motivational theory. When Maslow (22:90) discusses the esteem needs of an individual he uses terms such as achievement, mastery, reputation, and prestigue. Satisfaction of these needs leads to a feeling of individual worth and of being useful and necessary. When McGregor (24:56) extends Maslow's theory and discusses his Theory Y method of management he states, "Theory Y assumes that people will exercise self direction and self-control in the achievement of organizational objectives to the degree that they are committed to those objectives." Both authors also discuss the fact that commitment to objectives is related to the amount of direct participation in the formulation of those objectives.

The discussion of the need for motivators in an industrial setting can be extended to the academic institution. Likert (19:106) has discussed the implications of the social scientist research in industry:

> The highest productivity, best performance, and highest earnings appear at present to be achieved by System 4 [Participative] organizations. These organizations mobilize both the noneconomic motives and economic motives so that all available motivational forces create cooperative behavior focused on achieving the organizations' objectives. The enterprise is a tightly knit, well-coordinated organization of highly motivated persons. As social science research makes further substantial contributions to the art of management, science-based systems even more productive than System 4 are likely to be developed.

Recommendation 2. <u>The faculty of the college should be given some of the responsibility for achieving organizational goals. In particular, those goals involving academic matters should be the responsibility of the faculty</u>.

<u>Communication</u>. The section of the survey on communication had the highest arithmetic mean, 2.55, of any section. The two questions on the direction of flow of communications and the acceptance of downward communications were both well above average. The question on the accuracy of upward communication received the highest mean, 3.00, on the survey. This was probably due to the fact that those being surveyed were responsible for the upward communication.

However, the question on superiors knowledge of the problems faced by subordinates was well below average.

.Recommendation 3. <u>All key administrators who do not now teach should be required to teach at least one course per year</u>.

Because of the high rating of this section it appears that substantial improvement has been made in the communication area since the Middle States Accreditation Report of 1969 (36). One cannot however, underestimate the importance of communication. Unruh (47:29) feels that the failure to communicate accurately and effectively may turn out to be the central problem of modern university governance. This importance is again pointed out by Stroup (45:117), "the problem of communications in the modern college is formidable.... Yet, by means of effective communication the machinery of the whole institutional apparatus runs more smoothly."

Budig (6:39) has presented a very complete discussion of what the faculty expectations are in the area of communications.

> Faculty require communicative skill in administrators. They expect educational leaders who are articulate spokesmen for the faculty and institutional interest. Beyond this, they also desire administrative leadership capable of creating effective horizontal and

> vertical communication patterns. Good horizontal communication means effective communications from faculty to faculty, among students, from one administrator to another. Effective upward vertical communication - a very real need of faculty - implies largely passive communication skills of the administrator, such as openness and willingness to listen to faculty viewpoints on the part of a chairman or dean with some evidence of feedback. Downward vertical communication (dean to chairmen, administrator to faculty, faculty to student) ordinarily requires a higher proportion of the more active communication skills.

The problems of organizational coordination and problem solving both involve communication. The differences are pointed out by many authors. Richardson in (38:19) and again in (42:90), and Blau and Scott who conclude thier findings on communication by writing:

> A hierarchical organization, in part precisely because it restricts the free flow of communications, improves coordination; indeed, it seems to be essential for effective coordination of group effort. This is the dilemma posed by hierarchical differentiation: while it is necessary for coordination, it blocks communication processes that are vital for stimulating initiative and facilitating decision-making.

Interaction. The section of the survey concerned with interaction was average with an arithmetic mean of 2.35. The question on the characteristics of the interaction was well below average showing some fear and distrust was present.

Recommendation 4. More interaction between faculty, students, administrators and trustees should occur.

The question on cooperative teamwork was well above average.

Richardson (42:28) discusses the need for interaction as follows:

> As important as it is to prevent conflict or to resolve conflict, the interaction of administrative and governance structures may have a still more role. The ability of an institution to use its resources effectively for goal attainment depends upon the existence of a satisfactory degree of congruence between the objectives of the institution and the attitudes of its constituencies. The involvement of all constituencies in goal identification, program planning, and evaluation can be a powerful force in shaping such congruence.

Likert (19:29) presents this on a broader scale. He discusses that all members of an organization and their collective capacity for effective interaction, communication, and decision making are reflected in the internal state and health of the organization.

Decision-Making. The section of the survey that concerned decision-making received the lowest arithmetic mean of all sections, 2.17. Question twelve, on the level of decision making, was the lowest rated question on the questionnaire, 1.62. The question on the origin of background information used to make decisions was also below average. The question on subordinate involvement and the use of decision-making as a motivational tool were both above average.

The results of question thirty demonstrate that the faculty perceived that they were involved in the decision process but that the final decision was made by top administrators. This was also a major criticism of the Middle States Accreditation Report of 1971 (37:3). The faculty also perceives that they are not consulted enough in the decision-making process.

Recommendation 5. All decisions should be made at the appropriate levels, involving those most qualified to make the decision.

Recommendation 6. When a decision is reached at any point in the organization, it should be brought to the prompt attention of all those who will be affected.

Recommendation 7. When differences of opinion exist on the propriety of a decision a method of mediation should be formed.

Several authors have presented general discussions of decision-making. Among them are Corson (9:10-12), Likert (20), Stroup (45), Richardson (42:87-90), and Henderson (15:80). Budig (6:33) presents the facult expectations on decision-making in the following manner:

> Faculty reasonably expect that decisions will be made by administrative officers and that these decisions will be fair and just. The absence of decisions is an abdication of leadership which no faculty will long tolerate. A series of decisions unacceptable to the faculty simply requires new leadership. Ultimately, the requirements of "fairness" and "justice" in decision-making includes (1) a freedom from personal bias or personal benefit resulting from the decision; (2) a deliberate weighing of alternatives, including an openness to consideration of the relative merits (or disadvantages) of possible courses of action; (3) the existence of a fairly explicit value system upon which decisions are based; and when necessary, (4) the willingness to explain the rational basis for a decision. Implicit in these requirements is the understanding that values upon which decisions are premised are widely shared in the group. A basic value widely shared in any academic community is a commitment to rationality and open deliberations as a means of improving the human condition. Thus the arbitrary (unilateral) decision is per se viewed as the unjust or "unfair" administrative decision. A faculty member will generally accept a decision, even if he disagrees, if he feels he has had the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the deliberations prior to the decision and if he can require a rational defense from his administrator.

Setting Goals. The section of the questionnaire concerning setting goals had an arithmetic mean of 2.52. This was well above average and second highest on the survey. The two questions on how the goals are established and the resistance to these goals both were well above average.

Recommendation 8. The faculty should be more involved in determining the goals of the institution.

The research that has been presented relating to business, industry and the social sciences has demonstrated that in order to effectively reach organizational goals there must occur participation in the establishment of those goals. The tradition of collegiality in colleges has been strong. The faculty tend to think of themselves as peers of administrators. Afterall the business of education takes place in the classroom. The professor must play a strong role in determining the over-all goals of the institution.

Feedback Control. The section of the survey that concerned feedback control had an arithmetic mean of 2.25, slightly below average. The question on the existence of a resisting informal organization was well above average. Several of the surveys identified the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors, which consist of about thirty-five percent of the faculty, as an informal organization resisting the administration.

The question on the use of productivity information was slightly below average while the question on the review and control function was well below average.

During the past two years there has been much debate on the role of the department chairman. Their role has been

and still is chiefly clerical. There have been some changes to make the chairmanship more decisive but it is still felt that there is too much administrative control. This was probably the reason for the faculty perceiving the review and control functions were concentrated toward the top levels of administration.

Recommendation 9. <u>The department chairmen should be given broader and more definitive powers when dealing with faculty and departmental concerns</u>.

The feedback system is used to regulate the interrelationships within the structure of the college. The control of the feedback system ultimately affects the communication networks, interaction of the individual members, decision-making and the overall operation of the institution.

<u>Recommendations</u>

The following recommendations are made in the hope that they will help in making the governance structure at York College of Pennsylvania more participatory.

1. The administration and department chairmen should seek ideas from their subordinates and use them if worthy.

2. The faculty of the college should be given some of the responsibility for achieving organizational goals. In particular, those goals involving academic matters should be the responsibility of the faculty.

3. All key administrators who do not now teach should be required to teach at least one course per year.

4. More interaction between faculty, students, administrators and trustees should occur.

5. All decisions should be made at the appropriate levels, involving those most qualified to make the decision.

6. When a decision is reached at any point in the organization, it should be brought to the prompt attention of all those who will be affected.

7. When differences of opinion exist on the propiety of a decision a method of mediation should be formed.

8. The faculty should be more involved in determining the goals of the institution.

9. The department chairmen should be given broader and more definitive powers when dealing with faculty and departmental concerns.

Potential for Improvement

Although the overall arithmetic mean of 2.34 was used as a standard for comparison it should not be considered a desirable average. It lies somewhere between the benevolent authorative and consultative methods of management. It is far from being considered a participative structure. Since much of the current literature points toward a shared-authority form of governance there seem to be major changes needed to achieve this. It is hoped that the recommendations made will help to achieve this goal.

It should also be pointed out that some changes to improve the existing structure have been made, some as recent as the past year. Perhaps the existing structure is already sufficient and it will gradually move toward a participatory system. Most of the authors point out that it is often a period of years before changes made in a structure have an effect on the participants. Mess (31:40) states, "participation is not a theoretic problem but an implementation problem."

The difference between what the faculty perceives, the administration perceives and what actually exist could vary greatly. There has always been a conflict and probably always will be a conflict between faculty and administration. This problem is pointed out by Mortimer (30:482):

> Those who yearn for peace in colleges and universities will find it a relative condition. Institutions of higher education will have to learn to live with more or less permanent conflict and seek to make them serve the organization rather than destroy it.

While the administration is concerned with control, planning, communication and coordination it is the faculty who must reassume the leadership of the traditional collegial function, a role made even more critical by the necessity for the administration to involve itself almost entirely with management. Olsen (32:364).

While it is recognized that all institutions can be improved, it is now always appropriate to compare a college to a theoretical model. It is important to keep a comparison such as this one in perspective. There is no such place as the ideal college.

McGeorge Bundy (7:47) has an insight into the role of the faculty when he states:

> I believe trustees will continue to have a major role in the institution, and the readiness of the students for a greater share of the responsibility, whatever its immediate and temporary explosiveness, should be a gain for the university as a whole. But in the end, and unrepentantly, I insist on the faculty as the center. Trustees give time and money and advice and external support of all sorts; students spend some years here. But for the members of the faculty the university is life itself. This central commitment is what justifies their central role, and in their effective relations with the presidency is the center of the politics of the modern university.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allan, George. "Twixt Terror and Thermidor: Reflections on Campus Governance," The Journal of Higher Education, April, 1971, 292-308.

2. The American Association of University Professors. "The Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government," AAUP Bulletin, March 1955, 62-81.

3. _____. "Report of the Survey Subcommittee of Committee T," AAUP Bulletin, Summer, 1969, 180-185.

4. Aristotle. Poetics, trans. E. Barker. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

5. Blau, Peter M., and Richard W. Scott. Formal Organization. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

6. Budig, Gene A., and Stanley G. Rives. Academic Quicksand: Some Trends and Issues in Higher Education. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972.

7. Bundy, McGeorge. "Faculty Power," Atlantic, September, 1968, 41-47.

8. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

9. Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

10. _____. "The Modernization of the University: the Impact of Function on Governance," The Journal of Higher Education, June, 1971, 430-441.

11. "Data Presented for Consideration by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1968," York College of Pennsylvania.

12. Dodds, Harold W. The Academic President: Educator or Caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

13. Dykes, Archie R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

14. Fogarty, Robert S. "The Good Place or No Place: Communication on the Campus," In Search of Leaders, G. Kerry Smith, ed. Washington D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

15. Henderson, Algo D. "Effective Models of University Governance," In Search of Leaders, G. Kerry Smith, ed. Washington D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

16. Herzberg, Frederick, "One More Time; How Do You Motivate Employees?", Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1968, 53-57.

17. Ikenberry, Stanley O. "Restructuring the Governance of Higher Education," AAUP Bulletin, December, 1970, 371-374.

18. Joughin, Louis. "Faculty Participation in University or College Governance," Current Issues in Higher Education, G. Kerry Smith, ed. Washington D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1966.

19. Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

20. _____. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

21. Livingston, John C. "Faculty and Administrative Roles in Decision Making," Stress and Campus Response, G. Kerry Smith, ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

22. Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishing Co., 1954.

23. Mason, Henry L. College and University Government. Vol. XIV, Tulane Studies in Political Science. New Orleans: Tulane University Press, 1972.

24. McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

25. Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

26. Miller, Ray A. "The Presidents Report, 1973-74," York College of Pennsylvania.

27. _____. "The Presidents Report, 1974-75," York College of Pennsylvania.

28. Millett, John D. The Academic Community. New York: The MacMillian Company, 1957.

29. Moellenberg, Wayne P. "The Hazards of Academic Administration," Intellect, February, 1976, 374-378.

30. Mortimer, Kenneth P. "The Dilemmas in New Campus Governance Structures," The Journal of Higher Education, June, 1971, 467-482.

31. Ness, Frederic W. "Campus Governance and Fiscal Stability," Efficient College Mananement, William W. Jellema, ed. San Francisco: Josey-Bass inc., 1972.

32. Olsen, James K. "Governance by Confrontation: Adversarialism at the University," Intellect, March, 1974, 361-364.

33. Pfnister, Allan O. "The Role of Faculty in University Governance," The Journal of Higher Education, June, 1970, 430-449.

34. Pollay, Richard W., Ronald N. Taylor and Mark Tompson. "A Model for Horizontal Power Sharing and Participation in University Decision-Making," The Journal of Higher Education, March/April, 1976, 131-157.

35. Reddin, William J. Managerial Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

36. "Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees of York Junior College, York, Pennsylvania By an Evaluation Team Representing the Middle States Commission on Institutions of Higher Education After Study of the Institution's Self-Evaluation and a Visit to the Campus on February 16-19, 1969," Charles W. Laffin, Jr., Chairman.

37. "A Report From The Evaluation Team Who Visited York College of Pennsylvania on October 10-13, 1971," To the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association. Adolph G. Anderson, Chairman.

38. Richardson, Richard C. Jr. "Needed: New Directions in Administration," Junior College Journal, March, 1970, 16-21.

39. _____. "Restructuring in Human Dimensions of Our Colleges," Junior College Journal, February, 1971, 20-24.

40. _____. "Governance Theory: A Comparison of Approaches," The Journal of Higher Education, May, 1974, 344-354.

41. _____ and Louis W. Bender. College Governance. 2d. ed. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1974.

42. _____, Clyde E. Blocker and Louis W. Bender. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1972.

43. Riess, Louis C. "Institutional Attitudes Relating to Faculty Participation in California Community College Governance," A Doctorial Dissertation, 1970.

44. Smith, Bardwell and Robert Reitz. "Authority, Shared and Increased," Liberal Education, December 1970, 501-510.

45. Stroup, Herbert. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

46. Thompson, Dennis F. "Democracy and the Governing of the University," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Richard D. Lambert, ed., November 1972, 157-169.

47. Unruh, Jesse M. "California Higher Education: A Report from the Underground," In Search of Leaders, G. Kerry Smith, ed. Washington D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

Leadership	1)	How much confidence is shown in subordinates?	None	Condescending	Substantial	Complete
	2)	How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?	Not at all	Not very	Rather free	Fully free
	3)	Are subordinates' ideas sought and used, if worthy?	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always
Motivation	4)	Is predominant use made of 1) fear, 2) threats, 3) punishment, 4) rewards, 5) involvement?	1, 2, 3 occasionally 4	4, some 3	4, some 3 and 5	5,4, based on group set goals
	5)	Where is responsibility felt for achieving org. goals?	Mostly at top	Top and middle	Fairly general	At all levels
Communication	6)	What is the direc. of info. flow?	Downward	Mostly downward	Down and up	Down, up, & sideways
	7)	How is downward comm. accepted?	With suspicion	Poss. with suspicion	With caution	With open mind
	8)	How accurate is upward comm.?	Often wrong	Censored for boss	Limited accuracy	Accurate
	9)	How well do superiors know problems faced by subordinates?	Know little	Some knowledge	Quite well	Very well
Interaction	10)	What is character of interaction?	Little, always with fear and distrust	Little, usually with some condescension	Mod., often fair amt. confidence and trust	Extensive, high degree confid. & trust
	11)	How much cooperative teamwork is present?	None	Relatively little	Moderate amount	Very substantial amt. throughout organ.
Making Decisions	12)	At what level are decisions formally made?	Mostly at top	Policy at top. Some delegation	Broad policy at top, more delegation	Throughout but well integrated
	13)	What is the origin of technical and professional knowledge used in decision making?	Top management	Upper and middle	To certain extent throughout	To a great extent throughout
	14)	Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?	Not at all	Occasionally cons.	Generally consulted	Fully involved
	15)	What does decision making process contribute to motivation?	Nothing, often weakens it	Relatively little	Some contribution	Substantial
Setting Goals	16)	How are org. goals established?	Orders issued	Orders. Some comm. inv.	Aft. disc. by orders	Group action (except crisis)
	17)	How much covert resistance to goals is present?	Strong resistance	Moderate resistance	Some resistance at times	Little or none
Feedback Control	18)	How concentrated are review and control functions?	Highly at top	Relatively high at top	Moderate delegation to lower levels	Quite widely shared
	19)	Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?	Yes	Usually	Sometimes	No - same goals as formal
	20)	What are cost, productivity, and other control data used for?	Policing, punishment	Reward and punishment	Reward, some self-guidance	Self-guidance, problem solving

FIG. 5.1 PROFILE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Source: From *The Human Organization* by Rensis Likert. Copyright © 1967 by McGraw-Hill, Inc. Used by permission of McGraw-Hill Book Company.

York College of Pennsylvania
York, Pennsylvania
April 29, 1976

Dear Colleague,

I am doing a research project on faculty perception of college governance. The attached questionnaire will be used as my measuring tool. I am hoping the results will be of value to both the administration and the faculty.

It is realized that you are very busy and the time spent by you in filling out this form and returning it to my through inter-office mail is an imposition on you. However, the final study could prove to be important in making governance changes at our college.

On the attached form there are seven areas of concern to governance. Each area has several questions designed to evaluate. Please circle one of the four descriptors following the question that you feel best describes the governance system at our college.

Simply stated, I need your help in gathering my data and would appreciate a prompt reply.

Sincerely,

Jim

Jim Troutman
LS-45

JT/so